The political praxis of the 1AC is parallel to that of the Zapatistas in Mexico. Nonrepresentation is no longer a method of marginalization and subjugation, but is transformed through affirmation of difference and coexistence with all nature. Their revolution against neoliberalism and the state is continuous.

**Nail 10** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Zapatismo**, as a non-representational political event that **has brought hundreds of thousands** of people together **against neolib**eralism and **for** the **democratic defense of the earth, without folding to state politics**, green capitalism, or environmental bureaucracy, I believe, should be considered as an abstract machine. Like the phenomena of the revolution of 1789, the Paris Commune, and the revolution of 1917, what is singular about this event is its irreducibility to social determinism and deductive causal chains: in 1994, in Mexico, Zapatismo held no resemblance to any recognizable, legal, or legitimate thing within the present “state of affairs,” i.e., no political representation (party), no market representation, linguistic representation (their languages are not spoken or recognized by political representatives), or representation by the local indigenous leaders (Caciques). There was no causal necessity that Zapatismo should have existed, no way it could have been deduced from the domains of “rights” and “commodities” from which it emerged, and yet they “burst upon a world that denied their existence” anyway, as Zapatista scholar John Holloway says.26 **From the representational point of view of Mexican politics,** the marginalized and unrepresented **Zapatista**s of Chiapas **have no “legitimate” existence.** But what is most interesting about the Zapatista communities is that they do not legitimate their revolution strictly by presupposed norms based on identity (prescriptive requests for “rights,” the overthrow of the state, a new market economy, or a new ethnic nationalism), but rather affirm a self-reference or autonomy. **Instead of simply valorizing** their **difference and un-representability** as such**,** as Simon Tormey has argued, **the Zapatistas**, I am arguing, **have created a new form of ecopolitical evaluation that better allows them to realize** the **(self)management of forest commons**.27 Contrary to normative theories of environmental philosophy based on prescription, **the Zapatistas practice** a form of **rotational direct democracy where members take fourteen day shifts** deliberating and **facilitating** communal/**environmental matters, where they consider the ecosystem to be inseparable from who they are** as Zapatistas. As Subcomadante Marcos puts it, For a long time, this place has existed where men are Zapatistas, the women are Zapatistas, the kids are Zapatistas, the chickens are Zapatistas, the stones are Zapatistas, everything is Zapatista. And in order to wipe out the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, they will have to wipe this piece of territory off the face of the earth- not just destroy it but erase it completely, because there is always the danger of the dead down below.28 If we are to take this passage seriously, what it means **to be Zapatista is also to be the stones, trees, and animals** of the Zapatista autonomous zones. **Participatory** (as opposed to representative democracy) **and collective** (as opposed to personal or moral conscience) **decision-making** actually **is the whole ecological system speaking through** (as opposed to for) **the proper name of Zapatismo expressively**. “Zapatismo” is thus not a thing, or norm, that represents or signifies anything, but rather a singular and constantly renegotiated abstract machine.

**Thus, I advocate an embracing of Zapatista ecopolitics in resistance to resource extraction in [Note this is struckthrough] ~~developing countries~~**. I reserve the right to clarify, so no theory violations until he checks in cross-ex.

There is nothing static in the world. The AC is a rejection of totality and unity in favor of an ontology of difference. Everything is interconnected. The conscious mind is an illusion, the unconscious should be the point of ethics. This is an epistemic, ontic, and ethical claim. Marginalization of ecological knowledge by the state and corporations is both violent and the root cause of environmental damage.

**Hipwell 4** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

For Deleuze, **static identities are dangerous illusions: the real world is**, by contrast, **always fluid** and mobile**; reality is ontologically characterised by ‘difference’. This difference is not**, as it might seem, difference **between things** (an identitarian notion) **but** rather **the idea that reality is a continuum of** interplay, interpenetration and **interconnectedness** and that ‘things’ are merely intensities in this continuum, internally constituted by the interplay of different forces, and themselves interacting and interpenetrating with everything around them. In this sense, **allegedly separate entities are mutually** constitutive and **interdependent, and treating them as entirely separate** inevitably **does** intellectual and physical **violence to the world. In an ontology of difference, the world is viewed holistically**. Differential being is defined on the basis of what it is rather than what it is not. It is dynamic, not static. As Deleuze (1988, 123) puts it, ‘the important thing is to understand life, each living individuality, not as a form, or a development of form, but as a complex relation between different velocities’. While we may, for practical purposes, speak of ‘a tree’, ‘a fish’, ‘the human species’, etc., awareness of ontological difference reminds us that it is a mistake to abstract such things from their dynamic and continuous context. Prior to striation by identitarian forces, the world is made of ‘smooth space’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 474–500), or what Patton (2000, 112) has called ‘the heterogeneous space of qualitative multiplicity’. In smooth space, **diverse and unexpected interconnections may appear** and reconfigure (‘lines of flight’). **Smooth space is continually in flux; it is difficult to know intellectually** and (therefore) difficult to control. To know one’s way in the tangle of The Canadian Geographer / Le Ge´ographe canadien 48, no 3 (2004) 360 William T. Hipwell primeval forest or other ‘wild zones’ (Dalby 2001), one must have good instincts. Wisdom of the body Following early-twentieth-century philosopher Henri Bergson, Deleuze calls for the epistemological rehabilitation of intuition. He describes this intuitive epistemology as ‘transcendental empiricism’ or ‘wisdom of the body’. Prior to intellectualisation, **our instincts respond to and process** the **sensory data** received by the body **as a continuous** and multiplicitous **flow.** Thus, the way humans perceive the world through ‘wisdom of the body’ is better attuned to ontological difference (and therefore better capable of understanding smooth space) than through the intellect. This **‘libidinal epistemology’ provides us with an understanding of a** continuous, mobile, **fluid and interconnected world** (Ford and Hipwell 2001). A **shift** in focus **from identity to difference requires** a **greater reliance on the unconscious,** on **instinct and** on **knowing through the heart**. It requires, in many senses, an un-focusing. As an empiricist and materialist, Deleuze does not mean that un-focusing entails abandoning empirical knowledge gained through the representational intellect but rather augmenting it with wisdom of the body. He would argue that researchers—especially in the social realm—must come to recognise that variations and tangential relationships may often be more important than structures and causal relationships. Doel (1996, 430) advises that researchers learn ‘nomad thought’, ‘dwelling on change, becoming and inconsistency, rather than fixity, being and constancy’. Friedrich Nietzsche, a formative influence on Deleuze, made the argument for intuitive routes to knowledge in the nineteenth century. Nietzsche argued that . . . ‘being conscious’ is not in any decisive sense the opposite of what is instinctive: **most** of the **conscious thinking of a philosopher is secretly guided** into certain channels **by his instinct**. (Nietzsche 1966, 11) As Deleuze puts it **The great activity is unconscious.** . . . **Consciousness is** essentially **reactive; this is why we do not know what a body can do** . . .. The real problem is the discovery of active forces without which the reactions themselves would not be forces. (Deleuze 1983, 41) Geographer David Livingstone (1992, 1–2) echoes this sentiment, noting that the myth of science as proceeding solely through ‘experimental analysis and logical rigour’ has been thoroughly dispelled (see also Saul 2001, 5). In sum, reality can only be fully grasped with the aid of wisdom of the body, which is more attuned to difference than to identity. **Wisdom of the body is** implicitly **granted epistemological status in** the **local–traditional ecological knowledge** (Lo-TEK) **employed by peripheral communities** engaged in the small-scale harvest of natural resources (see Inglis 1993; Acheson and Wilson 1996). As is discussed below, the **marginalisation of such knowledge by state and corporate managers is a key cause of many environmental problems.**

There is no distinction between the human and nonhuman. The great mistake has been to assume human agency can exist separately from the nonhuman entities that facilitate it. Capitalism is the underlying logic of extraction and subjugation. Nothing except rejection can recognize the ways in which production conditions human desire and reason.

**Nail 2** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

Deleuze and Guattari begin their first collective work, Anti-Oedipus, with the rejection of the dualism between the supposedly autonomous spheres of nature and culture. Where industry extracts its raw materials from nature, consumes them, and then returns its refuse to nature, Deleuze and Guattari argue, following Marx, that this is not the operation of relatively separate spheres (production, distribution, consumption), but rather an activity predicated on the common structural relations of the capitalist division of labor and the concept of supposedly “fixed elements” within the overall process of profit generation. **Human beings do not autonomously extract raw materials** from nature**, nor do they autonomously decide to “save nature”** from unsustainable extractions or toxic waste disposals. **While** there are, of course, **human agents** who **speak of** the **“rights of nature” and “sustainable extraction,”** their very ability **to conceive of environmental protection in terms of “rights,” “labor,” and “value” is conditioned by** an advanced technoscientific coordination of research, organization, and **green capitalist industry. For this reason** Deleuze and Guattari can say, We make no distinction between man **[human] and nature**: the human essence of nature and the natural essence of man **become one** within nature **in** the form of **production** or industry, just as they do within the life of man as a species. Industry is then no longer considered from the extrinsic point of viewof utility, but rather from the point of view of its fundamental identity with nature as production of man and by man. **Not** man **[human] as** the **king of creation, but** rather as **the being** who is **in intimate contact with** the profound **life of all forms** or all types of being. **Human** activity and **“reason” is thus conditioned on an enormous matrix of non-human activities** (economic, biological, and technological structures, etc.), just as nature is conditioned by an enormous network of human activity. To assert an independence of one from the other is sheer abstraction. **Deleuze and Guattari’s conclusion is thus that there are only processes of mutual production** that are **neither strictly human, nor** strictly **natural,** but both, that is, artificial. Insofar as artifacts and technology are a mix between human activity and natural objects, Deleuze and Guattari claim that **all processes of production** (insofar **as they** too **are always natural/human**) **are machines.** And “every machine is a machine connected to another machine,” and **the multiplicity of machines connected up** with one another **forms** the “Mechanosphere” of **the earth** (AO 12/6). As Guattari insists, “We might just as well rename environmental ecology machinic ecology, because Cosmic and human praxis has only ever been a question of machines.”11

Transcendental ethical norms falsely assume human independence from nature. Ethics must enable a shared condition that facilitates creative expressions of subjectivity in that it can be constantly re-invented. Words, names, events, everything is a constant process of creativity and becoming. Affirmation of this creative power is the ultimate ethical goal.

**Nail 3** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

Where one might locate the concept of **an ethical “norm**,**”** “law,” or “condition” in environmental philosophy that allows disparate human voices to come to a common prescriptive agreement on a dispute, Deleuze and Guattari instead propose the alternative concept of an “abstract machine.”A norm does not describe the world the way it “is,” but how it “ought” to be. A norm **is** thus **a transcendent element intended by an autonomous** form of consciousness or sovereign **state unhindered by existential bias.** For instance, the prescriptive value of “ecological diversity” is defined in conceptual or legal terms, prior to or independent from any specific thing that might be described as realizing that value. Something either realizes biodiversity and is right or it does not and it is wrong. “Athing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise,” as Aldo Leopold asserts in his land ethic.23 Difference is thus only a difference from the same, e.g., the norm which represents the independent unity of the diverse. **Opposed to this, the abstract machine is an event or shared condition for action** and evaluation only insofar as it is **immanently transformed by** the **concrete elements that realize** and differentiate **it** . There is thus a “coadaptation” or “reciprocal presupposition” of the two that allows for their participatory transformation.24 **The event** thus **changes in nature each time there are** “reconversions subjectives actuelles” (actually occurring **subjective redeployments**) of it (DRF 217/236). Subsequently, according to Deleuze and Guattari, the abstract machine is absolutely singular and unable to be deduced from either history or introspection. In historical phenomena such as the revolution of 1789, the Commune, the revolution of 1917, there is always one part of the event that is irreducible to any social determinism, or to causal chains. Historians are not very fond of this point: they restore causality after the fact. Yet **the event itself is** a splitting off from, a breaking with causality; it is a bifurcation, a lawless deviation, **an unstable condition that opens up a new field of the possible**. (DRF 215/233) **The abstract machine** is not deducible because it **is the condition for** deduction, description, and **prescription itself**: it is a more primary evental commitment. **This machine is abstract in the sense that is not a thing among other things, but also real** (vrai-abstrait), insofar **as it** is a condition that **allows for** the appearance of “new space-times” and **new subjectivities antagonistic to representation and power** (P 233/172).25 However, while **it** may not be a thing, the abstract machine **is still marked by a** singular and asignifying **proper name**, date, and image, **like** the names of military operations or the names of **hurricanes**, as Deleuze and Guattari say (MP 51/28, 322– 323/264). **These names do not represent**, symbolize, or refer to **anything at all. Rather, they are spoken through**. As a self-referencing and autonomous event **independent from political representation, the abstract machine allows for** the **shared expression** and conjunction **of** the various **heterogenous elements that speak and exist through it** (MP 177–178/142).

The Zapatistas movement is one of continuous unfolding and continuous production of ways of life that are coextensive with nature. This is not only a commitment on material level, but a rejection of previous methods of libidinal investment. **Nail 4** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

The procedure of counting the affects of the situation thus decides what can or will be done in the assemblage. There are no universal ends or values that inhere in things themselves, only their immanent capacities to be assembled and reassembled in a continually renegotiated and expressive machinic assemblage or relation. Insofar as the Zapatistas practice such a continual and affective renegotiation of their ecological assemblage, without drawing on the concepts or practices of state-based or universal environmental rights, they effect a concrete machinic assemblage. That is, the **Zapatista communities** practice a form of collective valorization that **refer**s **back not to** the **sovereignty of the state,** or **the intrinsic value of nature, or any other pre-given teleology, but** to **the immanent act of determining** in each case **what their collective ecological body is capable of**. Assembled in a heterogeneous mix of NGOs, diverse indigenous traditions, and in ternational influence, the Zapatistas have had to learn how to manage the environment. This **commitment takes the form of several specific** forest management **affects: to be able to cultivate the land by the no-till method,** to be able to **ban slash and burn practices,** to be able to **take a limited amount of trees from the forest** or be penalized by having to plant and care for two more for every one taken in excess, **and** to be able to **ban agrochemical use.** As **a Montes Azules resident** explains**, “**we have been accused of destroying the jungle. But **we** as indigenous people are the true guardians of the environment, we **live together with the jungle. If the jungle dies, we die with it**.”32 **The Zapatistas do not speak for the forest, because** they are the forest, or rather, **their life is an affect of the forest**, “to be Zapatista in the Lacandon.” Their political practices express the life of the forest and exist as so many affects within its collection. Even their relations of production are owned in common and practiced sustainably. The workers’ cooperatives (honey, coffee, textiles, etc.) in Zapatista territory are based on collective or common (not private, or public) property, worker control, and self-management. While Zapatismo may have its flaws, **the spirit of these institutions** (the schools, the hospitals, the homes, the farming, etc.) **is**, as Guattari would say, to set up structures and devices that establish a totally different kind of contact. A kind of selfmanagement or **self-organization** of a set of problems **which** does not start from a central point that arranges elements, inserts them into a control grid, or establishes an agenda, but th]]]]]]]]]at, on the contrary, **allows** the **various singular processes to attempt a rhizomatic unfolding.** This is very important, even if it doesn’t work.33 Zapatismo is thus a struggle for the creation of a maximum of participation, both human and natural, in achieving an ecological “self-management conceived outside the criteria of a formal democracy that has proven to be sterile,” as Guattari puts it (MRB 391).

Creativity is the internal link to all of their fairness and education claims, it frames the process of debating. All arguments are already within the space of play that is debate and they only arose in their current forms because of it. Reject theory to bring debate back. Zagorin:[[6]](#footnote-6)

**This understanding of rules which sediment the boundaries of convention only to be swept away in the interplay of change, or which interpolate the opposition into conformity with the frame which it establishes, is thus similar to Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the inter-play between smooth and striated spaces, the latter which enables metrical progression, the former which enables a greater degree of experimental becoming. The negotiation of innovation cannot function without the establishment of a prior conformity—a negation insensible without a prior affirmation to ground its ontology—and thus we see a relationship of necessity between the assertion or understanding of prior rules and rhizomatically mobile technologies of challenge, resistance, critique, subsidence, as Deleuze and Guattari write, ...the two are linked and give each other impetus. Nothing is ever done with: smooth space allows itself to be striated, and striated space reimparts a smooth space, with potentially very different values, scope, and signs. Perhaps we must say that all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space. (1987, 486) Just as the condition of debate which enables restriction of certain arguments contingently from frames of consideration, it enables every argument to potentially be internally mutant within multiple interlocking frameworks. As Elizabeth Pass writes, “Smooth spaces are dynamic, and transformation is more important than essence” (2001, par. 9). Even in the moment of assertion of a particular rule-set, value-set, criteria-set, evaluative framework, the concern for the “essence” of these arguments is minimal to non-existent; gaming makes the employment of rules purely strategic and already folded into the flow of play. The argument that we need to act to stop violence means something radically different in a Kantian, utilitarian, and pure ontological framework. That same argument is internally dependent on value judgments about whether or not violence is good or bad, or whether acting to stop violence is the appropriate response to observing violence in the world. The frames change as debaters’ arguments compete and negotiate within them. In a framework which is only concerned with representations, the fact that the plan, if enacted, would save a million children, counts for almost nothing. This conceptual result itself may be a reason to reject the framework, but nothing is a priori; it can only be weighed against other counter-veiling considerations for which privileging representations in decision-calculus is, in and of itself, a meritous proposition. These observations demonstrate an important proposition about the activity: part of what gives debate its creative vibrancy is its ability to consistently re-draw the boundaries of discrete conceptual objects, to leave fluid the criteria of relevance for research and inquiry while simultaneously intensively pursuing that scholarship. In debate, the fruits of critical theory and persistent interrogation are not intellectual paralysis or withdrawal from political advocacy, but more often than not a reciprocal engagement with creative experimentation.**

Need to address the question of desire. This is the framing question for the round. **Stiegler 12** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

It was at the end of the 19th century and at the end of the 20th century that **capitalism met** with **its first two limits: The industrial revolution**, as the implementation of the capitalist system of production, is the extension of the process of grammatization whereby and wherein tertiary retentions (which include psychotechniques) are formed by apparatuses of the control of gestures which allow, as machine-tools, the liquidation of workers’ know-how, and, on this basis, the realization of immense gains in productivity, and the development of a new prosperity. However, besides the misery this process engenders in the form of the proletariat, it **encounters** the limit analysed by Marx as the tendency of **diminishing returns. To fight** against **this** limit of capitalist development**,** the American way of life invented the figure of **the consumer** whose **libido is systematically put to work to counter** the problems of **excess production**, which is the social concretization of this tendency of the rate of profit to fall. This canalization of the libido operated by the capture of attention ends up by liquidating the expertise in living [savoir-vivre] of consumers, by the **massive development of** societies of **services** which **let them off the hook of their own existences**, that is**,** of their diverse responsibilities as adults having reached their legal maturity. This is what ends up **provoking** the **liquidation of their** own **desire, as well as** the desire **of their own children, to the** strict **extent that the latter can no longer identify with them,** both because these parents no longer know anything, and are no longer responsible for anything, having become themselves big fat children, and because the process of primary identification is short-circuited by psychopower through the psychotechnologies. **This destruction of desire** (that is to say also the destruction of attention and of care) **is a new limit encountered by capitalism**, this time not only as mode of production, but also as mode of consumption, way of life, that is, as biopower having become psychopower. A third limit henceforth imposes itself on our attention. It consists in the fact that the **development** of the industrial way of life, inherited Care 111 from the 19th and 20th centuries, **has become** not only **toxic** on the level of minds and of libido, but also **on the geophysical** and biological **level.** This third limit will not be able to be raised or effaced before the invention of a mode of life constitutive of a new way of taking care and of paying attention to/of the world by the invention of therapeutics: techniques, technologies and socio-pharmacological apparatuses of the formation of attention corresponding to the organological specificities of our time: to the specificities of the technologies of transindividuation forming the infrastructure of an industrial system itself functioning in an endogenous way as a system of care: making care its “chain of value” that is, its economy, and thereby renewing with the original sense of the word economy, for to economize is to take care. **Western societies, in the sway of** the **exportation of tech**nologies **issuing from** their mode of **production, have engendered industrial competitors** (on whom Paul Valéry was already meditating as to their consequences to come) **by a movement** of financialization **that could do nothing but cause** a **global economic war**. In this new form of war, the stakes are a defense of society no longer as an enemy, exterior or interior, but against a process that ruins time, that is, the horizon of the long term, and the possibility of projecting this horizon in giving oneself objects of desire. **This** process **spins out of control at this precise moment when the effects of the three limits of capitalism combine.** Global competition fired up by financialization has ended up in the destruction of the complex equilibrium that allowed that capitalism’s development also be the social development of industrial democracies by the Keynesian organization of the redistribution of wealth under the authority of a welfare State, and it is in the context of the economic war which resulted that marketing has become, as Gilles Deleuze put it, “the instrument of social control” in the societies of control, and that the tendency of libidinal energy to self-destruct suddenly worsened. Thus, on the side of consumption, **the capitalist mode of life has become** at the end of the 20th century **an addictive process less and less capable of finding sustainable satisfactions—**this has induced great discontent in the civilization of **consumption,** which **has replaced culture, that is, care**, if we accept that culture precedes cults **of** all types, that is, **attachments to objects** whose ensemble constitutes a system of care. It is in this context that Jenny Uechi could write in Adbusters that: According to surveys conducted recently by the sociologist Juliet Schor, 81% of Americans estimate that their country is too centered on consumption and almost 90% of them consider that it is too materialistic.

Traditional notions of subjectivity operationalize a regime of thought that makes shared imaginaries impossible, which are a precondition for debate. This is telemorphosis: regimes of memory that pave the way toward extinction. The aff provides a new imaginary through Stiegler. Cohen:

If it is possible to note that theory’s retrieval of human and animal otherness against the horrors of capitalism is akin to political deferrals of the future for the sake of saving the present, then we might ask what might open the reactive self-bound logics beyond homeland security? What has been absent to date is any shared or possible climate change imaginary—or a critical matrix. The problem is that the other materialities that constitute the forces of **climate change would pulverize whatever informs “imaginaries” in general, which have always been tropological systems. When a recent critical query asks, for example, how to define “a political subject of climate change” the authors focus on how the “climate crisis shapes particular subjectivities,”** properly putting any rhetoric of “crisis” itself to the side as appropriable**. The problem lies in** the premise of **defining a “political subject” or subjectivities to begin with: “Unsurprisingly,** much of **the current discourse on climate change oscillates between these two poles: most dramatically, between imminent catastrophe and** the prospect of **renewal; between unimaginable humanitarian disaster and the promise of a green-tech revolution. As such the climate crisis regularly calls forth regimes of risk” [Dibley and Neilson 2010: 144]. This Janus-faced algorithm, the “political subject of climate change” (147), arrives as a form of cognitive disjuncture: “these two images. . . are alternative figures of the subjectivity of ecological crisis. They are complimentary. . . . something like a dialectical image of the subjectivity of climate change” (146). On the one hand,** this theoretical intervention is typical of the cognitive reflex toward pre-emption of the worst in arguments focused on mitigation, on sustainability, and on various “environmental” agendas—despite **none of these answering to what science would demand. Sustainability has been angled to “sustain”** the level of **comfort and acquisition that** the economy of **“growth” demands.** On the other hand, there is a reflex of occlusion**.** This **straining for** a **“subjectivity” that would account for a political feature of this new landscape comes up with** two mutually canceling algorithms:a **desperate sense of imminent crisis and** end, alongside **a hope of something as lulling as ‘subjectivity’. As a number of essays in the volume imply, one might proceed otherwise: depart or begin from a subject without subjectivity (Catherine Malabou), or an exteriority without interior ( Justin Read). The aporia of an era of climate change are structurally different from those that devolved on the torsions of Western mestphysics. They are not the aporia explored by Derrida around the figure of hospitality, taken as an endless refolding that keeps in place, while exposing, a perpetuated and lingering logics that defers the inhospitable. (One mode of deconstruction as solicitation involves shaking the house or structure within which one finds oneself, and this circuit might itself be disturbed by a refusal to occupy.) As Masao Myoshi [2001] first suggested, the logics of extinction compromise the aims of an emancipatory future along with all else.** Any project of **“formal democracy” runs up not only against the twenty-first century post-democratic** telecracies that render that episode of 90’s thought transparently inscribed in **the neo-liberal fantasy (or propaganda) it would appropriate back for the then bruised “Left.” But it** also faces the transparency by which market democracy not only appears a Potemkin figure itself but, in fact, guarantees planetary ruin by the demographic requirements of cars alone for any emerging middle class of India and China (as Arundhati Roy argues).4 Any focus on global population control runs up against feminist progressivism [Hedges 2009; Hartman 2009]; post-colonial narratives that would restoratively mime the promise of 90’s neo-liberalism of a world of market democracy would require three planets of resource materiel to allow dispossessed others to reach our levels of prosperity. The profound 90’s investment in the “otherness of the other,” an other who would be recognized, communed with, raised into the polis, and colonized, appears today as a stubborn archaism and, perhaps, as an epochal error, that maintained the sovereign trace of subjective mastery. It would seem that both metaphysics and its deconstruction jointly participated in what is now disclosing itself as the “anthropocene”—an epoch of self-affirmation into which Enlightenment ideologemes have played, as Dipesh Chakrabarty analyzes in the term “freedom.”5 The impasse between today’s spellbound and rapacious present and supposed future generations, the rupture of any imagined moral contract to or recognition of same, has been in circulation for a while. The present volume of essays focuses on this under-examined question: how do mnemotechics, **conceptual regimes, and reading—a certain unbounded textualization that exceeds any determination of writing—participate in or accelerate** the **mutations that extend,** today, **from financial systems to the biosphere**? **The volume gives this a name, telemorphosis.**
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